

PATENT COOPERATION TREATY

From the
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

To:

see form PCT/ISA/220

PCT

WRITTEN OPINION OF THE INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY (PCT Rule 43bis.1)

Date of mailing
(day/month/year) see form PCT/ISA/210 (second sheet)

Applicant's or agent's file reference
see form PCT/ISA/220

FOR FURTHER ACTION
See paragraph 2 below

International application No.
PCT/B2004/002136

International filing date (day/month/year)
28.06.2004

Priority date (day/month/year)
27.06.2003

International Patent Classification (IPC) or both national classification and IPC
H04M1/725, H04M1/274

Applicant
NOKIA CORPORATION

1. This opinion contains indications relating to the following items:

- ☒ Box No. I Basis of the opinion
- ☒ Box No. II Priority
- ☒ Box No. III Non-establishment of opinion with regard to novelty, inventive step and industrial applicability
- ☐ Box No. IV Lack of unity of invention
- ☐ Box No. V Reasoned statement under Rule 43bis.1(a)(i) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement
- ☐ Box No. VI Certain documents cited
- ☐ Box No. VII Certain defects in the international application
- ☐ Box No. VIII Certain observations on the international application

2. FURTHER ACTION

If a demand for international preliminary examination is made, this opinion will usually be considered to be a written opinion of the International Preliminary Examining Authority ("IPEA"). However, this does not apply where the applicant chooses an Authority other than this one to be the IPEA and the chosen IPEA has notified the International Bureau under Rule 66.1bis(b) that written opinions of this International Searching Authority will not be so considered.

If this opinion is, as provided above, considered to be a written opinion of the IPEA, the applicant is invited to submit to the IPEA a written reply together, where appropriate, with amendments, before the expiration of three months from the date of mailing of Form PCT/ISA/220 or before the expiration of 22 months from the priority date, whichever expires later.

For further options, see Form PCT/ISA/220.

3. For further details, see notes to Form PCT/ISA/220.

Name and mailing address of the ISA:



European Patent Office - P.B. 5818 Patentlaan 2
NL-2280 HV Rijswijk - Pays Bas
Tel. +31 70 340 - 2040 Tx: 31 651 epo nl
Fax: +31 70 340 - 3016

Authorized Officer

Ayala Perriello, M-P

Telephone No. +31 70 340-4465



10/562566

IAP20 Rec'd PCT/PTO 27 DEC 2005

**WRITTEN OPINION OF THE
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY**

International application No.
PCT/IB2004/002136

Box No. I Basis of the opinion

1. With regard to the **language**, this opinion has been established on the basis of the international application in the language in which it was filed, unless otherwise indicated under this item.
 - ☐ This opinion has been established on the basis of a translation from the original language into the following language , which is the language of a translation furnished for the purposes of international search (under Rules 12.3 and 23.1(b)).
2. With regard to any **nucleotide and/or amino acid sequence** disclosed in the international application and necessary to the claimed invention, this opinion has been established on the basis of:
 - a. type of material:
 - ☐ a sequence listing
 - ☐ table(s) related to the sequence listing
 - b. format of material:
 - ☐ in written format
 - ☐ in computer readable form
 - c. time of filing/furnishing:
 - ☐ contained in the international application as filed.
 - ☐ filed together with the international application in computer readable form.
 - ☐ furnished subsequently to this Authority for the purposes of search.
3. ☐ In addition, in the case that more than one version or copy of a sequence listing and/or table relating thereto has been filed or furnished, the required statements that the information in the subsequent or additional copies is identical to that in the application as filed or does not go beyond the application as filed, as appropriate, were furnished.
4. Additional comments:

**WRITTEN OPINION OF THE
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY**

International application No.
PCT/IB2004/002136

Box No. II Priority

1. ☒ The following document has not been furnished:

- ☒ copy of the earlier application whose priority has been claimed (Rule 43*bis*.1 and 66.7(a)).
- ☐ translation of the earlier application whose priority has been claimed (Rule 43*bis*.1 and 66.7(b)).

Consequently it has not been possible to consider the validity of the priority claim. This opinion has nevertheless been established on the assumption that the relevant date is the claimed priority date.

2. ☐ This opinion has been established as if no priority had been claimed due to the fact that the priority claim has been found invalid (Rules 43*bis*.1 and 64.1). Thus for the purposes of this opinion, the international filing date indicated above is considered to be the relevant date.

3. Additional observations, if necessary:

**WRITTEN OPINION OF THE
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY**

International application No.
PCT/IB2004/002136

Box No. III Non-establishment of opinion with regard to novelty, inventive step and industrial applicability

The questions whether the claimed invention appears to be novel, to involve an inventive step (to be non obvious), or to be industrially applicable have not been examined in respect of:

- ☐ the entire international application,
☒ claims Nos. 1-49

because:

- ☐ the said international application, or the said claims Nos. relate to the following subject matter which does not require an international preliminary examination (*specify*):
☒ the description, claims or drawings (*indicate particular elements below*) or said claims Nos. 1-49 are so unclear that no meaningful opinion could be formed (*specify*):

see separate sheet

- ☐ the claims, or said claims Nos. are so inadequately supported by the description that no meaningful opinion could be formed.
☐ no international search report has been established for the whole application or for said claims Nos.
☐ the nucleotide and/or amino acid sequence listing does not comply with the standard provided for in Annex C of the Administrative Instructions in that:
the written form ☐ has not been furnished
☐ does not comply with the standard
the computer readable form ☐ has not been furnished
☐ does not comply with the standard
☐ the tables related to the nucleotide and/or amino acid sequence listing, if in computer readable form only, do not comply with the technical requirements provided for in Annex C-bis of the Administrative Instructions.
☒ See separate sheet for further details

**WRITTEN OPINION OF THE
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING
AUTHORITY (SEPARATE SHEET)**

PCT/IB2004/002136

Re Item III

- 1.0 The various definitions of the invention given in independent claims 1, 8, 13, 14, 29, 33, 44, 48 and 49 are such that the claims as a whole are not clear and concise, contrary to Article 6 PCT. The claims should be recast to include only the minimum necessary number of independent claims in any one category, Rule 6.1 PCT, with dependent claims as appropriate, Rule 6.4 PCT.

If the Applicant maintains a plurality of independent claims, he is requested to discuss the single inventive concept these claims would have to share in order to meet the requirements of Rule 13 PCT, and to explain why it was not possible to base one single independent claim on this concept.

In view of the above objections it is not at present practicable to establish an opinion on the patentability of the claims.

- 2.0 Upon amending, the Applicant is requested to carefully consider the disclosure of the prior art documents cited in the International Search Report, and if he should regard some particular matter, independent claims taking into account the objection regarding Article 6 PCT should be filed where the inventive contribution to the prior art is clearly delimited with respect to the above mentioned documents (Rule 6.3 PCT).

The Applicant should also indicate in the letter of reply the difference vis a vis the state of the art and the significance thereof.

The relevant prior art documents should be identified in the description and the background art disclosed should be briefly discussed (Rule 5(a)(ii) PCT).

Reference signs in parentheses should be inserted in the claims to increase their intelligibility, Rule 6(2)(b) PCT.

In order to expedite the procedure the Applicant is requested to indicate with his reply where there is a basis for the amendments in the application as originally filed.

The description must be brought into conformity with the new claims to be filed (Rule 5(a)(iii) PCT); care should be taken during revision, especially of the

**WRITTEN OPINION OF THE
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING
AUTHORITY (SEPARATE SHEET)**

International application No.

PCT/IB2004/002136

Re Item III

introductory portion including any statements of problem or advantage, not to add subject-matter which extend beyond the content of the Application as originally filed, Article 34(2)(b) PCT.

